



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,697	12/30/2003	Wolfgang Kalthoff	13907-061001 / 2003P00407	2888
32864	7590	07/19/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.			BELL, CORY C	
PO BOX 1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/747,697

Applicant(s)

KALTHOFF ET AL.

Examiner

Cory C. Bell

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/14/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Any rejections not repeated have been withdrawn.
3. Applicants arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rauen in view of US 7043489 (Kelly) filed Feb 21, 2002.

5.

5.1. *As per independent claims 1 and 9*, Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

receiving data inputted in a data entry format by a user through a user interface; transforming the data from the data entry format to a first data storage format; {Para 388. Para 708}
identifying an error in the data in the first data storage format, the error belonging a particular type of error; {Para 570}

routing the data to a selected one of first and second error corrections based on the type of the error{Paras 583-589}

receiving corrected data from the selected one of the first and second error correctors
{Para 591};

and storing the corrected data in the first database in the first data storage format. {Para 388. Para 708, figure 25}

However Rauen fails to expressly disclose:

Wherein the data in the data entry format excludes information required by a data entry rule, and wherein the data in the first data storage format includes the information required by the data entry rule. These features are taught by Kelley in Col 14 lines 8-13. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide these features to prevent missing data.

6. *As per dependent claims 2 and 10*, Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the transformation is performed by a rules-based procedure. {Para 388 teaches using a mapping which is a rules-based procedure using the broadest reasonable interpretation}

7. *As per dependent claims 3, 7, 11 and 15*, Rauen teaches the limitations as follows:

3. The method of claim 1, further comprising providing default data values in the user interface to the user. {Paras 733 748 and 749}

Art Unit: 2164

8. *As per dependent claims 4 and 12*, Rauén teaches the limitations as follows:

4. The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving data identifying the user. {Para 140}

9. *As per dependent claims 5 and 13*, Rauén teaches the limitations as follows:

5. The method of claim 4, further comprising: deriving additional data to be stored in the first data storage format based on the inputted data and based on the identity of the user; storing the additional data in the first database. {Para 586 teaches deriving associations between the users enterprise id and the entered data}

10. *As per dependent claims 6 and 14*, Rauén teaches the limitations as follows:

6. The method of claim 4, further comprising defining dynamically the data entry format based on the identity of the user. {Para 807 teaches a user profile for storing the language of the user which intern is used to selected the data entry format}

11. *As per dependent claims 8 and 16*, Rauén teaches the limitations as follows:

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising: transforming the data from the data entry format to a second data storage format; and storing the data in a second database in the data storage format. {Figure 30 teaches storing data in a second storage format(another language) and storing it in a second data base}

12. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rauén in view of Kelley and US 5182705, known hereafter as Barr.

12.1. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected for the following reasons:

Art Unit: 2164

12.1.1. Rauen teaches the subject matter of all claims upon which claims 17 and 19 are dependant, but fails to expressly disclose the limitations of claims 17 and 19.

12.1.2. Barr teaches the limitations of claims 17 and 19 in col 61, the caseload monitoring function being used to maintain a balanced workload, inherently includes workers with more work then the average not getting assigned cases, and instead those cases being shifted to those with a lower workload. The reassignment function also provides a means for shifting work from one employee to another.

12.1.3. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features of Barr in Rauen, as it provides the advantage of an organized and automated workflow management system to make work more efficient.

12.2. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected for the following reasons:

12.2.1. Rauen teaches the subject matter of all claims upon which claims 18 and 20 are dependant, but fails to expressly disclose the limitations of claims 118 and 20.

12.2.2. Barr teaches the limitations of claims 18 and 20 in col 61.

12.2.3. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the features of Barr in Rauen, as it provides the advantage of an organized and automated workflow management system to make work more efficient.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2164

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Alison Balter's Mastering Access 97 Development teaches databases storage formats having required fields. US 2002/0184308 Teaches how to perform internationalization (I18n) transformations. US2002/0156688 teaches a global commerce system using I18n. Us 6018742 teaches creating multilingual database systems. US 5442782 teaches a multilingual/I18n database system. Designing Multinational Online Stores teaches I18n of web-based stores. Federated Database Systems for Managing Distributed, Heterogeneous, and Autonomous Databases teaches how to implement a distributed database system, like that implemented in Rauen.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cory C. Bell whose telephone number is (571) 272 2736. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272 4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER